## United States District Court Northern district of California San Francisco division

United States of America,	Case No. CR /7-373
Plaintiff, )	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
v. )	
Jean Faaletonina ) Defendant. )	
For the reasons stated by the parties on the recotime under the Speedy Trial Act from Supplied finds that the ends of justice served by the contant and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S. finding and bases this continuance on the follows:	.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this
Failure to grant a continuance w See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	ould be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
number of defendants, the nature of novel questions of fact or law, that it is use	aplex, due to [check applicable reasons] the of the prosecution, or the existence of mreasonable to expect adequate preparation for hin the time limits established by this section. See
Failure to grant a continuance we counsel, taking into account the ex 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	ould deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain ercise of due diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. §
Failure to grant a continuance wo of counsel, given counsel's other schedul exercise of due diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C.	ould unreasonably deny the defendant continuity ed case commitments, taking into account the § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
Failure to grant a continuance we reasonable time necessary for effective pridiligence.  See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	ould unreasonably deny the defendant the reparation, taking into account the exercise of due  SEP 1 2017
IT IS SO ORDERED.	SEP 17 2017
DATED: <u>Sep. 11, 2017</u>	SEP TO A SEP TO LOS SEP TO LOS SEP TO LOS SEP TO LOS SUSAN Y. SOONG SUSAN Y. SOON
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	R. Leonard R. Lonard States Attorney